

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

PAUL WILLIAM PILGER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-01833-JCM-NJK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION  
TO STAY

(Docket No. 17)

Pending before the Court is Defendant Bank of America, N.A.’s motion to stay discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. Docket No. 17; *see also* Docket No. 6 (motion to dismiss). The motion to stay was filed on filed on March 18, 2016, but Plaintiff has failed to file a response to date. *See* Docket; *see also* Local Rule 7-2(b). The Court finds this matter appropriately resolved without oral argument. *See* Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed below, the Court hereby **GRANTS** the motion to stay discovery.

“The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending.” *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). The case law in this District makes clear that requests to stay all discovery may be granted when: (1) the pending motion is potentially case-dispositive; (2) the potentially dispositive motion can be decided without additional discovery; and (3) the Court has taken a “preliminary peek” at the merits of the motion and is convinced that the plaintiff will be unable to state a claim for relief. *See, e.g., Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013).

....

1 The Court finds these factors are present here. First, the motion to dismiss is potentially case-  
2 dispositive as it challenges all pending claims. Second, the motion to dismiss can be decided without  
3 additional discovery. Third, the Court has taken a preliminary peek at the merits of the motion to  
4 dismiss and believes it will be granted.<sup>1</sup>

5 Accordingly, the motion to stay discovery, Docket No. 17, is hereby **GRANTED**. In the event  
6 that the motion to dismiss is not granted in full, the parties shall file a joint proposed discovery plan  
7 within 14 days of the issuance of the order resolving the motion to dismiss.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: April 8, 2016.

10  
11   
12 NANCY J. KOPPE  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Conducting this preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because the  
27 assigned district judge who will decide the motion to dismiss may have a different view of its merits.  
28 *See Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 603. The undersigned's "preliminary peek" at the merits of that motion is  
not intended to prejudice its outcome. *See id.*